



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,512	09/08/2003	David L. Cutsforth	1099.1103102	9160
28075	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			MCDONALD, SHANTESE L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3723		

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/657,512	CUTSFORTH, DAVID L.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Shantese L. McDonald	3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2005.

2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 34-38,44-46 and 51-62 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) 61 is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 34-38,44-46,51-54,56,57,59,60,62 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 55 and 58 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 56,59 and 62 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 34-38,44-46 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grutza et al.

Grutza et al. teaches a method of creating a spiral or helical shaped groove in a surface of a collector ring of an electrical motor of an industrial generator, wherein the collector ring remains coupled to at least a portion of the electrical device, (col. 1, lines 15- 20), the method comprising cutting the groove in the surface of the collector ring using a rotary grinder, (col. 1, lines 25-41), located on a support that allows for lateral movement along the surface of the collector ring, and the cutting tool having a cutting action that functions independently from the motion of the collector ring, (col. 1, lines 50-

52). Grutza et al. also teaches a hand held rotary grinder, (col. 1, line 64-col. 2, line 3 and col. 6, lines 38-43).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 54,57 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grutza et al. in view of Coquillart.

Grutza et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for cutting a groove in a collector ring wherein the groove is not present before the method is performed. Coquillart teaches cutting a groove in the collector ring, (col. 2, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to cut the grooves in the collector ring of Grutza et al., as taught by Coquillart, in order to enhance the performance of the collector ring.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 55 and 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 61 is allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to the added limitation that the grooves be formed by a hand held rotary grinder, Grutza et al. teaches a grinder that is, "to be portable by hand and to have a grinding wheel mounted directly to the shaft", (col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 3). Even though the grinder is mounted during the grinding operation, the grinder is described to be hand held, which means that even though it is mounted, it can be directed and maneuvered by hand. The Grutza reference goes on further to teach that, "finish grinding and polishing may be accomplished using a hand held polishing/grinding stone", (col. 6, lines 38-43).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese L. McDonald whose telephone number is (571) 272-4486. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.L.M.  
July 19, 2005

  
Joseph J. Hail, III  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 3700